DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 074 136 TM 002 499

AUTHOR	Westbury, Ian; Korbelik, John
TITLE	Evaluation of a Goal-Focused Educational Program in Social Work.
SPONS AGENCY	National Center for Educational Research and Development (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Feb 73
NOTE	50p.; Paper presented at annual meetings of Council on Social Work Education and American Educational Research Association, February 1973
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Curriculum Development; *Curriculum Evaluation; *Educational Objectives; *Social Work; Speeches; *Summative Evaluation

ABSTRACT

Results from an evaluation study of a new masters' program in social work are described. The paper focuses upon the interaction between program goals that are conceived in terms of (1) the need to train social work students in three methods of social work, and (2) the need to prepare students who could address the problems of disorganized urban communities, and the five-year process of operationalizing these goals. The program had only mixed success in realizing its aims. (Author/DB)

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED 074136

TM 002 499

EVALUATION OF A GOAL-FOCUSED EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM IN SOCIAL WORK *

Ian Westbury

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

John Korbelik

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

This investigation was supported by a grant from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

Paper Presented

Annual Program Meeting, Council on Social Work Education, San Francisco, California, February, 1973.

American Educational Research Association 1973 Annual Meeting, New Orleans, Louisiana, February, 1973.

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

INTRODUCTION

This paper will report some speculations that derive from a summative evaluation we recently completed of the final years of a five-year curriculum development project in the School of Social Work at Private University. The objective of the project shifted in the course of its history, but in its last three years its goal was the development of a program designed to train students for a "generalist" social work practice - helping individuals, families, small groups, and larger social systems move towards change so as to promote the best possible relationships between individuals and their environment. All social work methods, were seen as being relevant to this practice and all levels of society - intra-personal, familial, inter-personal, social-environmental and institutional were seen as possible targets of intervention and focus for work.

The Generalist program was, in the two years we worked with it, only a mixed success. There were high points, of course, and the program did communicate its fundamental theses about the mission and practice of social work to its students. Thus, all students accepted the necessity for a multi-focal, multi-methods practice in social work. Ten of the thirteen students saw work for the extension of worker function or role by way of negotiation within an agency for sanction to meet identified but unmet needs of their clients as an important obligation of the practitioner. Half of the students in the sequence (as compared with a quarter of a matched control sample of students in other sequences in the school) regarded advocacy as a proper worker role.

However, although they accepted these general prescriptions for their work, most students failed to demonstrate any real understanding of most of the middle level considerations implied by a practice-conception that had elements of this kind as its central theme. For example,

1. Most students of the sequence did not show any greater understanding than did their peers in other sequences of the school (which did not regard this material as central) of the organizational items on the faculty-developed test that we used as our summarative measure of congitive outcomes. The faculty rated these items as "being of fundamental importance for beginning (Generalist) practice.

2. Most students in the sequence did not demonstrate any greater understanding than their peers in treatment sequences in the school of the community work items on our summative test. Although the test was developed and approved by the faculty of the sequence these same faculty tended to regard these items as of only limited significance for Generalist practice. The integration of all three social work methods was a crucial componet of the rationale for the program.

3. Few students (3 of 13) were able to articulate a conception of Generalist practice which answered in a satisfactory way two questions which seemed to us integral to any sophisticated and generalisable interpretation of their practice:
"How would you decide to more to different levels of intevention on a given problem?" and "how do you allocate time to different levels of intervention?" Only students who had experienced a form of Generalist practice prior to entering the program or were of high academic ability were able to articulate satisfactory answers to these questions. We should add that the faculty had difficulties with these same two questions.

As we have implied in each of these summary findings part of the failure of the Generalist students can be attributed to failures in the treatment offered them by the program. The faculty were, as suggested, unable to agree among themselves on the centrality to Generalist practice of the community work items - one member of the faculty wrote the items to reflect content that he thought was crucial, other members of the faculty accepted his items but did not agree with his feelings about their importance to Generalist practice. The faculty experienced difficulty when asked to elaborate and develop some of the operational entailments of their practice conception. We also found that the field experience offered by the program failed to routinely meet all of the minimal standards that the sequence had set for itself.

This sample of findings only highlights the kind of problems that we found the Generalist program experiencing in the two years we observed it. We will not pursue these problems here, rather we wish to address a different issue and explore how we can account for these findings. The search for a way of answering this question became a very important one for us in our role as teachers. The Generalist faculty were all experienced teachers of social work, they had all been sought individually by the program for the skills and experience that they could bring to the sequence, and, as a group, they worked harder on both curriculum development and teaching than any other teaching group we have seen -- yet, as our findings suggest, commitment, experience, teaching skills, and

highly-elaborated practice rationale, and many hours of deliberation did not mix to produce a curriculum that ran smoothly and delivered on its goals. Why?

SYMPTOMS

The intended outcome of the Generalist project was a curriculum, an educational plan with a set of goals, a set of sub-goals which are to be approached on the way towards ultimate objectives, and a set of means, "alternatives of action, of social organization, and of procedures that contain high probabilities of attaining goals".[1] Inasmuch as curriculum goals are not translated into the terms of an educational plan and inasmuch as a given plan does not contain or imply a set of means (not necessarily written or articulated) with high probabilities of achieving the goals suggested by the plan, we must judge that curriculum a failure.

If we use this criterion we must judge the Generalist project a failure. Our summative tests of outcomes and some of our data on the curricular treatment show that many of the goals of the program were not achieved. But this finding came from data analysis undertaken at the conclusion of six quarters of teaching. Our interactions with the Generalist faculty in the course of the year both foreshadowed the general character of these findings and offered us a basis for an interpretation of the failure of the developmental process.

---

1. For these concepts see Louis M. Smith and Pat M. Keith , Anatomy of Educational Innovation: An Organizational Analysis of an Elementary School. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1971, p. 46.

When we encountered the Generalist faculty we had an initial impression of a group of teachers working systematically towards the development of an educational plan. They articulated for us a highly elaborated practice-rationale and practice-conception and oriented us to their work by way of a syllabi containing statements about learning goals and experiences (See Appendix). They recognized that they were having some problems in packaging their practice-conception into the terms of a program but attributed these problems to insufficient time and the like. We accepted this interpretation but in February (in the fifth month of our work with them) we began to question the adequacy and validity of this interpretation of the program's problems. We observed a long discussion at a sequence meeting about the assignment that was to be given to the methods class on Generalist assessment. Our field notes on that meeting read as follows:

> Long discussion of the purposes of the assignment on assessment. F. says that she wants them to give an assignment that gives the students an opportunity to look at literature as a way of getting hold of the field. The assessment outline should be the vehicle that they use in this foray. Topic suggested: "Read through the literature cited in the reading list and write about it." G. suggests "Explore how it applied to practice." F. agrees.
>
> As a group they seem to be having difficulty grounding the assessment notion in the literature, Peculiar: How was the Assessment model derived and what are they doing in class with it. The faculty seem, in this whole discussion to be groping for structure. They have no eclectric method that permits them to articulate the generalist frame in a way that can hook into an existing literature.

Another later incident led to this same kind of questioning of the faculty interpretation of their difficulties. We knew, from remarks made by faculty, from the reactions we heard students making and from our own attendance in class, that Generalist methods classes were not always satisfying for either faculty or students. Content was too often thin, presentations were sometimes very wooden, and differences between faculty all too often appeared. Initially we were prepared to accept the diagnosis the faculty offered to account for this problem--the interpersonal relations between faculty were not always easy and surfaced too often in class, the team format aggravated (as it invariably does) these always latent problems, there was not enough time for preparation, etc. However, the following Fall, we participated in a discussion that suggested that there might be another analysis of the problems possible that, if clarified, would have quite different implications than those seen by the faculty.

Five of us, three faculty members and the evaluation staff, were examining an early version of a case scenario that we wanted to use on our summative test. The outline scenario suggested that the Generalist worker who had been assigned the Jackie case should, given the generalizability of the child molesting problem for the neighnorhood we had written into the case, move as purposefully as possible to formally assign Jackie herself to another (say the hospital psychiatric case worker who has some jurisdiction in the matter) to free himself for action on the more general problem in the neighborhood that the Generalist rationale dictated. The consideration of this move on this (imagined) worker's part raised for us one of

the more general problems of how does a Generalist worker make decisions of this kind about the assignment of his time to different levels of problem situations. Should the worker always seek to work at the neighborhood or community level if such an intervention seemed useful in prevention? How does a worker effect a balance his obligations to a particular client and the more general issues of prevention? And how should these decisions be made given a 9 to 5 day and only moderate investment (for workers have wives and children) in the profession?

Questions of this kind were, we thought at the time, central to the Generalist practice conception as we understood it and, in asking our initial question, out of curiosity, we assumed that the faculty would be able to give us ready answers. We were dismayed that the faculty members present at the meeting were unable to articulate any (to us) clear answer to the question--or, to put it more carefully, any answer we found clear. The question subsequently became one of our obsessions and, in one way or another and at different times, we asked this question of almost all the faculty in the program. We found that none of the faculty in the sequence could articulate any ready answer to the question and that at least one member of the teaching team repudiated the assumption that had been ultimately accepted by the three faculty we had originally worked with in our original drafting--that in the case of Jackie the worker should automatically seek to assign the client to another worker to secure time to effect a neighborhood intervention.

The upshot of this probing on our parts was the gradual emergence of a diagnosis of the problem facing the program that was quite different than the one offered by the faculty: Was it possible that none of the faculty had worked the Generalist practice-conception clearly enough in their own minds to present it convincingly and authentically to students? And, if this was so, how persuasive could the assurances of the faculty about the viability of the Generalist practice-conception, if not the presentation of it, be? What justification could the faculty have for their confidence in the validity of the practice-conception that undergirded the Generalist sequence? Once we had these questions many incidents and anecdotes in our field notes fell into new perspective.

> I'm impressed by the fact that we're still talking about the "Generalist notion" and the "Generalist approach". We're still dancing around--What is it? What is unique to the Generalist? Why are we so reluctant to pin it down? Since I don't know what the Generalist is I have to do everything in terms of "what the social work process is", etc.
>
> We haven't been able to help the students with the integrative task sufficiently because we are still working on it ourselves. This is the central congitive issue and relates to the student feeling that if the program continues in the way it has been going they won't get anything and won't be able to do anything when they get out.
>
> Something happens to us in teaching. When we find ourselves in the situation of throwing something out and getting no response, then if <u>anybody</u> picks up <u>anything</u> we're grateful. There is an unrelatedness in what students pick up because it's done of the basis of idiosyncratic interests...and we're afraid to stop because it's <u>something</u>.
>
> We haven't always had time to ask the best questions: we haven't time to think what they might be. This is part of the bungling we've done.

As these statements imply, as we were told again and again by the faculty, and as we knew as a result of our own contact with the program, the Generalist was, at best

> Worked out in ideology . . . (but) it needs more work on the content within which it gets worked out: the specific type of field assignments, what to look for and the unifying concepts.

The consequences that flowed from absence of a specific and coherently defined content ran through the program: The problems in instruction that followed from this lack of a clearly defined content had long troubled the Generalist program and were not new to our year of association with the program. In fact, the issues of order and sequence, of integration of content, of prescription of objectives and the like had been most fully faced before our contact with the program, in 1969-70 when a full-time chairman had been appointed to the sequence with the task of ordering faculty intuitions and experience into a program with objectives, units, readings, and the like. The structure developed in the course of that year became the basis for the curriculum for the Generalist classes that we observed.

However, the prescriptions and agreements embodied in this program outline were not enacted by all members of the faculty and the program outline did not serve to guide and control faculty teaching. The form of some units of classroom

content that was developed out of this outline was not acceptable to some members of the faculty while other seemingly essential content (e.g., the organizational materials) did not receive adequate attention in either class or field. In short, a year's intensive work on curriculum development did not have the systematizing outcome that the faculty had sought. One comment by a faculty member suggests why this might have been so.

After the completion of our analysis of the field experiences of students in the program, we asked one member of the faculty why no students seemed to have had one of the prescribed experiences. We were told that that particular class of learning had been included in the program only because John B., a group worker with a treatment orientation, had insisted that such experience was a crucial componet of group social treatment and that the faculty had deferred to him on this matter. Clearly, this deference, given this point of view at that time, was procedural and formal and did not entail intellectual assent by the faculty as a group.

Likewise the answers that the faculty gave us to our interview questions, "On what basis does the program determine its content? On what basis do you weigh the various facets of the program in your own mind?" both support this interpretation and also offer insight into the ways in which members of the Generalist faculty, as individuals, saw the formal curriculum that they had developed:

> Expediency. With whatever we could dredge up that was available in someone's head, e.g., case material.
>
> Good hard thinking about what we thought students had to know.
>
> Sheer giving in to some faculty when we knew better.
>
> Many ways. It's been developmental--partly dictated by funding (community based, multi-service delivery), expedience, different backgrounds, and experience, commitment of faculty, composition of the student groups--all of these have had an impact.
>
> In various ways: a) ideally on the basis of the goals we're trying to reach and on what we know of the laws of learning; b) on the strengths and interests of the faculty; c) on the need to maintan a relation with the main corpus of social work so we can't move too quickly or too far because this would lead to anxiety.

Clearly the operational field curriculum and the emphasis of class teaching, reflect the effects of a recovery on the part of individuals, in the privacy of their field unit, from the "sheer giving in to some faculty when we (read I) know better" that characterized sequence meetings. Divergence from the formal curriculum would no doubt be justified by individuals by claims that would derive, ultimately, from " good hard thinking about what we (read I) thought students had to know". Nothing that the faculty as a group decided, and no deliberation of the faculty as a group could over-ride these private conceptions. And nothing in the formal goals of the program or in the statements of principle about what the program was attempting was unambiguous enough to force a questioning of these private visions.

We saw in our observation of faculty meetings a fundamental scenario reenacted again and again that illustrated this kind of deference to individual faculty. The faculty would assemble to consider a concrete problem in the program, one that required immediate decision. The issue would be put and one or another member of the faculty would make a proposal based on their own conception of the needs of students or the true nature of the Generalist. A discussion would follow in which conflicting conceptions of how the Generalist idea should be enacted would emerge. There would be no resolution of this conflict possible within the terms of the originally posed problem with the result that, perforce, the conflict would shift upwards to a consideration of the fundamental nature of Generalist practice. Differing conceptions would emerge at this level as well and a resolution would be sought at a yet higher level. But, by the time that this resolution had been affected (and such resolution was necessary if a given team was to go into class, to teach as a team, the next day) time had run out. The original problem was then addressed in the last few minutes of the meeting either by way of delegation to one person to come up with a solution or by way of quickly sketched compromises that papered over rather than solved the original problem. When and if the original problem could have several resolutions (e.g., the sequence of units that would be taught in the methods class) it was possible to allow multiple answers that satisfied the interests of as many individuals as were involved, thus honoring tacitly the prerogatives of each person as a member of the Generalist faculty to act out his perceptions of the program.

The result of these ritual elaborations was a highly developed and highly visionary doctrine for social work practice. By the conclusion of the experiment this doctrine had become an important part of the professional lives of faculty: it offered them a conception of purposes for both practice and teaching that connected them in a central way to the needs and realities of social work practice as they saw it; this doctrine put them, they felt, in the forefront of the developments within the profession. But this common doctrine was achieved and shared <u>because it was abstract.</u> And abstractions could not guide the concrete planning that was needed for the Generalist program to function as an ordered, organized, and coherent sequence. Yet the feelings of satisfaction that the faculty had about their gradually evolving doctrinal convergence tended to mislead them when they were confronted with the day-by-day needs and problems of the program. Difficulties were seen clearly enough but when such difficulties surfaced in faculty meetings they tended to be interpreted by the group in terms, say, of the resistance to learning of the students or in terms of the lack of time that the faculty had to devote to detailed development. The projection onto the students was, of course, partly defensive (and was not merely projection for the students were a difficult group) and time was a problem at all points in the sequence but we believe that the developmental problems that the Generalist sequence reflected at this point in its history was a consequence of the very conception of the sequence.

DIAGNOSIS

The Generalist program was, in its beginnings, the training componet of the efforts undertaken by Private University to establish a neighborhood multi-service Center, a clinical research and teaching facility designed to:

> bring together a major school of social work and a dozen agencies to constitute a network of services for a multi-problem community. It is intended to consolidate welfare and other community programs, to bridge gaps between knowledge and practice, to demonstrate and test new methods, and to train welfare personnel.

The Generalist program as such had two aspects derived from "hunches related to social work education, and to the needs of the ghetto": on the one hand, it was to be a vehicle for testing out ideas in the School about the efficency of a combined methods-practice instructional format, about the feasibility of year-round use of educational facilities, and about the possibilities in forms of multi-methods instruction; on the other hand, it was a way of exploring the possible man-power needs of the practice and systems-delivery models developing in the course of the planning for the Neighborhood Service Center. These two distinct sets of aims were not disentangled at the point at which the Generalist Program was launched. three years before the planned opening of the Center itself, with the consequence that both committees, and the faculty responsible for the Generalist experiment contained persons who were interested in one or another aspect of both of these ambitions.

The confusion of purposes at the heart of the planning for the Generalist program had inevitable repercussions on the work of the faculty responsible for teaching the first Generalist classes. Almost from the beginning of the program there was a struggle within the Generalist faculty between those who saw the Generalist in terms of the general problems of social work education and those who saw it in terms of the service delivery notions being developed by the planners of the Center. And there was no Center, only plans for a possible Center--with the consequence that the debates amongst the proponents of one or other of these camps had inherently theoretical cast. The minutes of the faculty meetings from 1967-69 clearly record the struggle between these differing viewpoints and suggests that, at least in discussion, the view of those members of the group who identified with the planning for the Center's service delivery notions won the conceptual struggle:

> 8/4/67
> Goals of the Neighborhood Service Center Program: Agreement that the goal is to develop a more effective worker for the high risk family. Several issues were discussed:
>
> 1. Social work needs a different type of worker. Practice in all methods is becoming concerned with the high risk family. Orthodox methods of evaluation and treatment are not directly applicable to this clientele.
>
> 2. To be effective with this clientele the social worker needs to have some knowledge of all methods of problem solving.

11/24/67
Discussion of the Generalist Concept

1. Casework and group work can be integrated (being clinical) but the inclusion of community work was questioned.

2. What do we see as the end product. The Service Center was set up to educate social workers to work with high risk clients.

3. What is a generic social worker? How much skill can we expect our students to have when they graduate? Should they have specialized skill in one method and general knowledge about the other two? Can we expect them to have beginning competence in all three methods?

2/5/68
While discussing sequence structure it became apparent that a definition of the "generalist" must be developed before teaching objectives and content of the Social Work Practice Course can be decided upon. Each staff member was to write up a definition of the generalist as he conceives it--to be discussed at the next meeting. (Never followed up.)

9/23/68
A number of general questions were raised regarding planning time etc. The staff agreed that it would be well to go back historically and review such matters as why there is a Neighborhood Service Center, where did the generalist concept originate, etc. In answering this question the following statements were made:

> The Center was developed originally through a Children's Bureau grant which was made because of their interest in training and research: the school felt a need to respond to the field's interest in training more students as well as a desire to experiment with social work education processes; since 1965 when the feasibility study was undertaken there had been changes in the general climate both within the city and within the University: a greater emphasis has been put on the demand for community service by the University..

The Neighborhood Service Center is one answer to this. The staff felt that this was most helpful and suggested other questions for discussion at later meetings such as (1) the family advocate model for students . . . (5) the generalist concept, (6) how effective is social work in the urban ghetto, (7) what is the difference between the student when he enters and six quarters later.

10/10/68
Faculty expressed concern that no definition of the term "generalist" was developed. The feasibility of the family advocate model was discussed. Again the fundamental issue of generalist training as a base for all specialities, or as a separate model, was raised.

11/11/68
Development of the generalist concept--ideas considered.

1. One approach would be

    a. to identify a social problem which is serious in the community

    b. study and research this problem

    c. develop a new service delivery system, to deal with the problem

2. The generalist concept should start with the innovations in service (in the Center) which would feed into curriculum.

3. Some cases treated by the student unit were discussed as well as the process of starting with individuals then isolating common problems . . . and finally the development of some means to work with the problem to effect change.

12/5/68
Identification of the focus of the Generalist program.

1. A particular social problem (put all the efforts into one area).

2. The disorganized multi-problem family.

3. Is the generalist approach only appropriate to people living in the ghetto? One answer: it depends upon the amount of disorganization of the family--could be common to all classes of people.

What roles will the students be trained for?

1. Social work administration

2. Methods for working with most deprived client groups

3. How to teach people to work in the ghetto

2/14/69
Staff agrees on the following three elements as the focus of the Generalist:

1. This method would serve clients whose background indicate pervasive social disorganization.

2. There is a problem solving focus rather than an emphasis on method.

3. It is a family advocate model in which a push to enlarging the system to meet the needs of clients as well as help the client.

In summer 1969, in response to the confusions and problems of the nascent Generalist sequence a full-time chairman was appointed to the Generalist sequence. In the fall of 1969 the planning done to that point on the Neighborhood Service Center was reviewed by a newly appointed dean of the School; the plans that had been developed by the then-director of the Center were rejected, with the result that he resigned during the 1969-70 school year. Inevitably the Generalist program entered a new phase of its history--the conception of the Generalist as part and parcel of School-initiated assult on the problem of the ghetto became increasingly problematical: The new chairman of the sequence focussed her attention on the generalizable theoretical components of the Generalist model. The concrete image of the Generalist that had been accepted seemingly, in February 1969, of a mode of practice that would serve clients whose background indicated pervasive social disorganization, became unstuck from every point of view. The validation of Generalist planning that had been sought in a conception of the Center and its programs became lost. The discussions and arguments recorded in the minutes of sequence meetings again became abstract and principled as the faculty sought a new rationale for their work.

> 10/27/69
> What is the significance and meaning of the Generalist goal, method, and function?
>
> 11/3/69
> Work on objectives:
>
> 1. Nature of the program:
>
> a. The goal statements should not be restricted to the point of limiting the program to the inner city.

b. The educational goal must be linked to the field experience.

c. What is our conception of "community"?

d. What is the emphasis for our training?

e. What is meant when we speak of pervasive social disorganization? Could this mean problems of proverty?. . .

2. Nature of content

a. While it was reasonable initially to start with cross methods, now we need abstract principles. Are we at the stage at which we can identify principles? What do we have? What is needed? . . .

Objectives of the Generalist sequence:

1. To formulate general objective statements extracted from what faculty have done so far in discussions . . .

2. To evaluate the statement and alter it as seems appropriate from the experience of the last two years.

3. To work from objectives to develop a sequence.

The statement of generalist objectives raises the following questions:

1. Social and intra-personal problems should not be viewed as exclusively polarized points of view for consideration of treatment-intervention. Multi-problem families are affected by societal and situational multi-deficits and intra-personal problems, often all three.

2. The pervasive effects of proverty should be examined for similarities and differences in rural and urban settings.

3. Can problems be solved by a social worker, teams of social workers and other professionals, teams that include professionals and paraprofessionals? What then should be the specific nature of the social worker? . . .

4. What is the target of the sequence--what kind of practitioners do we expect students to be? What do we expect students to know?

5. Should objectives be stated in terms of human needs rather than in terms of problem situations?

6. Is openess for a variety of interventions a thrust for the generalist? Will the generalist model provide better and/or more service and less turning away of clients because the problem does not meet agency or worker definitions of service or service competence?

7. How is family stability to be viewed? How might it differ from crisis intervention or crises prevention in the usual context of crisis theory?

11/24/69

1. It was suggested that greater emphasis be devoted to support and more adequate and complete services for families in need rather than separation of family members. The idea of prevention was introduced with the suggestion that the uniqueness of the Generalist be developed around prevention rather than protective services.

12/1/69

Are social work goals mainly related to change, stabilization, or maintenance of the status quo? Is there a unique approach to these problems in the Generalist program? What functions are required to reach generalist goals . . . Tentative consensus around the following:

1. Social work has a goal related to change.

2. Social work should see both goals and functions in relation to power arrangements geared to meeting ends.

3. Social work functions and goals should move in the direction of helping agencies develop for change.

12/15/69

The Generalist concept is in question--Need to spell out objectives; can cross methods teaching be the best we can do?

12/17/69
Two major themes: Is the Generalist theory viable?
Has it been implemented? . . .

> There seemed to be agreement that the Generalist will be expected to work upon graduation in unstructured settings and that learning about our program problems and issues constitutes the necessary preparation for such work.

There is a clear difference between the kinds of agreement reported in these minutes between the earlier and later periods in the program development. Those of the earlier period ("This method would serve clients whose backgrounds indicate pervasive social disorganization") foreshadow a practice and a content for a methods class--those of the latter period ("Social work has a goal related to change"--Social work's function and goals should move in the direction of helping agencies develop for change") have no such implication. For those members of the faculty who had lived through the first period the discussions that led to this latter agreement offered the possibility of theoretical elaboration of hard-wrought intuitions; for the members of the faculty who entered the sequence after summer 1969, without an experience of the earlier work there was no context, and so no meaning for these discussions--and it was these faculty who expressed the most concern to us, the least sympathy for the feeling that the faculty had progressed, and the least understanding of what the program was about. Their experience of the Generalist did not let them see the progress that had been made.

Yet, while there was development in this sense through the five years of faculty discussion associated with the Generalist experiment, the change in the form of discussion that took place after the summer of 1969 exacerbated the fundamental problems that had faced the program from its beginnings. The earlier discussions

do appear to have been forging some measure of agreement among those faculty who chose to remain with the sequence on the focus of the practice that they were seeking to embody in the program. Admittedly the image of practice that this focus was drawing upon was only half-formed, it rested possibly on merely verbal and formal agreement of the kind that we saw so often and, in the absence of an opportunity to explore its meaning in the context of the Neighborhood Service Center, it was ambiguous and undeveloped--but the image was, we believe, at least half real and did foreshadow a content and a form of social work practice that might have been realizable and so might have been useful as a basis against which speculation could be tested. The shift in the focus of discussion that took place after the summer of 1969 had no such implication; the questions that this discussion posed opened up theoretical and abstract problems (e.g., prevention vs. treatment in Generalist practice) and, as such, served to divert attention away from the task of forging a working and interpersonally meaningful conception of Generalist practice that would have permitted the Generalist faculty to make decisions about concepts and skills they might teach their students. The concern for curriculum that marked this later period of the program appears to us to have been dysfunctional. For it was not grounded in any common conception or image of a practice; and, while time was spent in the discussion of doctrine, no time was available for the search for cases that could be used in class to illustrate a practice, to the search for a content that flowed more or less logically from a conception of practice, or to the induction of new faculty into the details of a particularized and bounded conception of Generalist practice. Perforce, the Generalist concept

became, when separated from any commonly held vision of practice, an ideology that could be defined only in terms of the differences between a Generalist worker and the "methods-based worker": as such the concept could command the affective loyalty of all members of the faculty, but it could not offer the basis for a program that was other than all of social work. A belief in the Generalist could not override interpretations of the ideology that individual faculty brought to the sequence by virtue of their earlier experience; and it could not offer a scheme that could facilitate the search of students for a common identity in social work. The jostling among faculty and students for ways out of dilemmas that these ambiguities produced engendered conflict, frustration, and depression with consequent feelings on the parts of both faculty and students of impotence and incapacity.

This is not to suggest, however, that conflict, frustration and depression were characteristics of the Generalist program after its reorganization in Fall 1969 and were not omnipresent in the earlier period. Nor does this imply that the development of the program in its second phase represented a retreat away from a developing order into chaos. The deliberations about the program, about its curriculum, purposes, and the like that marked its history after the Fall of 1969 were, of course a response to problems that had been writ large in the program to that point. In practice the only constants in the history of the program were the School's initial commitment to a program that had a cross-methods orientation, incorporated some innovations in the process of social work innovation, addressed the problems of service delivery in the ghetto, and problems of one kind or another. The problems flowed from the incapacities of the successive

committees , with their changing memberships and differing and changing commitments to aspects of the School's charge to them, that were created to deliver on these purposes, to resolve the intellectual, curricular, and instructional problems entailed in an inadequately specified mandate. The satisfactory implementation of any one of these goals required means; the committees that were created to find these means had, in their memberships, too many conflicting conceptions of both the meaning of the ends and implications for the means to make their search for a viable curricular form feasible.

Yet there was a conception of the meaning of Generalist practice emerging in the Winter of 1969 that was accepted by the faculty (at least verbally) and did offer the possibility of bounding both a subject matter that the Generalist should address (and so a content for the theoretical parts of the program), a view of the meaning of the program's commitment to multi-methods, and organizational context for the practice that might have served to ground the program's concern for administrative, organizational, and service delivery problems: This conception would have met, had it been elaborated and developed, the problem that surfaced again and again in the years in which we observed the program. "One of the difficulties with seeing the Generalist as something new is that we use the old terminology. It is hard to see the Generalist as anything but a better, more aware social worker. There is a need for something tangible: This I know, this I can do. Is there yet an identifiable field

of practice?"[2] Such a conception might have offered the discipline that the faculty needed as they sought to define and enact a curriculum that had clear structure, boundaries, content, field experiences, and integrative potentialities. One team was charged in November 1969 with the task of working out such a conception. But, as we have seen, this effort had little impact on the program during 1970-72 and even the conception was, to a considerable extent, lost. How and why did this happen?

We have outlined two of the factors that caused this potential definition of the Generalist to be lost: the fading away of the idea of the Neighborhood Service Center removed such impetus as the faculty had to explore a new practice for the inner city, the School's commitment to maintain the Generalist as an outgoing program meant that faculty who had not gone through the experience that had produced this conception entered the Generalist program committee and introduced their own, often different conceptions of the Generalist into the already over-burdened hopper. But there is, we believe, still another cluster of factors which, perhaps more than any other, aggravated the task of enacting this image in the program--with the consequence that even those faculty most committed to this view lost their hold of it.

---

[2]Generalist Sequence Minutes.

In March 1970 the Generalist sequence graduated a class of students whose performance and attitudes towards the program had reached almost legendary proportions by the time we worked with the sequence. They were, we were told, invested, eager, etc., and their performance was that of real Generalis'. The attitudes of this class to the program were surveyed by questionnaire at the conclusion of their experience in the School and the results of this survey clearly support the view the faculty held of them.

There were 21 students in this class. All were given assignments involving agencies other than their primary field placement and often had secondary placements. The range of collaborative contracts with agencies other than their primary placement ranged from one to twenty, with a median of seven.[3] Nineteen of the 21 felt that they could practice casework as situations demanded it, 18 felt similarly about group work, and 14 about community work. None of the students indicated that they would have chosen one of the regular programs of the School over the Generalist.

Some of the problems that the sequence experienced throughout its history with the methods class surfaced in the reactions of this earlier class. While fourteen of the students had favorable reactions to the first three five gave a clearly favorable response to the social work methods class, none was strongly favorable, seven neutral, and seven unfavorable or very unfavorable. The teaching team was criticized as lacking cohesiveness and divided in their viewpoints.

---

[3]These results are not significant in and of themselves. The faculty who taught this class emphasized the willingness of this class to collaborate meaningfully with other agencies and search for opportunities for such work.

But these findings do suggest a different pattern of response to the program than the one we found in our study of the March 1972 class. Seemingly these earlier students' perception of the overall quality of the experience they were given allowed them to accept the difficulties their team had with the methods class. And, in the view of the faculty, the major differences between this class and the later classes was in "commitment to the learning process."

There are similarities between the overall profile of this March 1970 class and the profile of the "successful" students in the class we studied--the March 1972 graduates. The March 1970 graduates were predominantly academically able, from undergraduate colleges with highly selected student populations[4], and had, some experience in social work. This class brought to the Generalist the qualities of conceptual abilities, experience, eager commitment to social work, and a readiness to consider social and organizational problems.[5] Experience and ability were the variables we found associated with mastery of the elements of the Generalist concept in our study of the students in the March 1972 class. And our observations suggest that enthusiam, deep commitment, and generalized problem-solving skills and interests

---

[4]While 36.8% of the March 1970 graduates came from undergraduate institutions rated 7 or 6 (schools of the highest selectivity) by Astin, only one (7%) of the March 1972 class did so. Half (7 of 14) of the March 1972 class came from schools rated 2 or 1 (least selective) while only 10.5% (2 of 19) March 1970 graduates came from these schools.
Alexander W. Astin, Predicting Academic Performance in College. New York: The Free Press, 1971

[5]While half (57.1%) of the March 1970 class wanted additional courses on Macro topics (e.g. economics and political science) most (71.4%) of the March 1972 graduates wanted courses on treatment related topics (e.g. ego-psychology and family treatment).

were the qualities most prized by the faculty as they informally evaluated students in both the March and the December classes. These qualities we associate with the students we know who have been entering such organizations as VISTA and the Peace Corps. Many of the students in this earlier class were of this kind.

Most of the students in the March 1972 class were not model students given a conception of the ideal Generalist student that had its origin in an image of this kind. And, as we have seen, the faculty failed to connect to their needs, and their aspirations. Our results show the extent to which the program failed to narrow the variance in both the cognitive and and conceptual domains to produce Generalists who possessed a common ideology, set of understandings, skills, and program experience. We attribute much of this failure to problems that followed from a lack of the match between the expectations and the aspirations of many of the students and the faculty. Many members of the class we studied were not teachable, at least as far as the faculty and the Generalist program was concerned.

This failure of the Generalist curriculum, and so of the faculty who were working within it, exposes the most vexing problem of the Generalist experiment as it evolved over its five years. By 1970-72 the Generalist was an approach to practice, a point of view, and an ideology rather than a mode of practice. It was the product of successive committees made up of social work educators who were all reformers of what they saw as the traditional methods and curricula of the profession. They saw

Generalists as a potential cadre of the leaders who would be in the forefront of responsive change in the profession. Their conception of leadership was not clearly articulated but for all of them it involved such qualities as a capacity to live beyond self, and to see problems and possible solutions without the blinkers of tradition and routine, the ability to negotiate organizations, and a primary commitment to clients and their problems. A Generalist was more than merely a conscientious worker offering high level methodical, but basically routine, service to clients.

This common perception of the Generalist as an activist problem solver--whatever his professional milieu--who could intervene in environmental, intra- and inter-personal and organizational domains on behalf of a client, who could see deficits in service and the organizationa, institutional, and societal ramifications of the clients' problems, a vision of professional functioning based in images of professional rather than administrative leadership, blinded the faculty to both the professional and curricular problems that an actualization of any of their aspirations posed. The integrative focus that they sought, and depended upon for such success as they achieved, resided in what were in effect personality traits rather than educable capacities. Students came to the sequence ready or not ready for a socialization to this role. The Generalist ideology oriented those who were ready to the organizational, societal, and environmental ramifications of service delivery,

it inducted students into the possibility of a multi-methods practice, and justified a training experience that would prepare potential leaders for this view of the leadership role. The tasks of routine teaching were comparatively unimportant, even trivial, in the context of this higher conception.

Many of the problems that the sequence faced flowed from the consequences of this most fundamental conception of the program. The faculty themselves differed in their private elaborations of the spheres and the contexts in which leaders were to function and in their view of the commitment of the program to the inner city. For some members of the faculty the inner city and its families required a special kind of leadership because of its special kinds of problems. For others the inner city was merely a training ground in which more generalizable leadership skills could be acquired. For some members of the faculty problems that faced social welfare demanded that leadership be exercised in the public sector, in complex organizations, for others the innovative private agency working in a neighborhood was the image which captured their aspirations, for still others the image of leadership was captured by conceptions of clusters of private and public agencies working together on common problems.

But, these conflicting images were reconcilable and collapsible into a conception of generic leadership--and the Generalist faculty did readily achieve that reconciliation. But no means flowed from such reconciliations. Different images of both the functions of the Generalist and his context

entailed different conceptions of the experiences, understandings and skills that students should be given. But the focus on goals and ends that both the reconciliation of differences among the faculty and the needs which a program focussed on socialization required made a systematic and disciplined attack on the problems of means very difficult. The organizational mandate to continue the program and the decisions to recruit students who did not share the form of the faculty's vision further complicated their task. The succession of faculty, recruited to the sequence at different times and so at different stages in the program's development, to meet an array of organizational (e.g., manning the class) and experiential (e.g., experience with the different methods) needs predictably failed to achieve a robust enough consensus about both the operational goals and means to develop a viable, methodical, and interpersonally authentic plan that had educative power. The Generalist committee produced, in the words of the old aphorism, a camel.

To the extent, therefore, that the Generalists failed to achieve such a whole the Generalist experiment failed. But hindsight suggests that the task they were given was probably doomed to failure from the beginning. The School gave the task of creating a grand design to a committee and charged them to give shape to a set of undefined goals, by first outlining a practice, then rationalizing that practice, and then creating a curriculum, a set of means that captured and distilled the essence of that rationalization.

The faculty making up this committee had few precedents which they could use to help them in this work and no readily accessible practice models on which they could draw. The School had, at the point at which the idea of the Generalist was mooted, little recent experience with curriculum development upon which they could draw. In this context the faculty struggled manfully to understand each other's point of view, to learn to work together as a committee, and to learn to teach students together. Success might have been possible had they been working together as Generalists before they attempted to mount the program, or had they been charged with working through the implications of one person's conception of what the Generalist was, or had they the task of adapting well known methods or intellectual structures to a specific domain of practice. But the Generalist faculty had all of these tasks to complete at once.

SOME CONCLUDING REFLECTIONS

We have pursued this narrative and analysis of the Generalist experiment at some length in the hope that we could develop a frame from which we could move to some more general speculations. Our own needs for ways in which we might interpret our findings led us to this speculation but we hope that our use of those notions that we were able to find or develop offer some basis for generalization of our Generalist specific argument.

The goal of the Generalist program throughout its history was to produce an educational plan, a set of goals, a set of sub-goals which are to be approached on the way towards ultimate objectives, and a set of means that guarantee in a probabilistic sense that ultimate goals might be attained. The Generalists failed to achieve such a plan and to that extent they were unsuccessful. The plan that they developed to control their activities was too ambiguous, and too uncertain, in its essentials to override individual feelings about what the plan <u>should</u> have contained; it was too vague where it should have been detailed to provide the guidance that faculty who were to teach in ways that were consistent with its intent required. The dissonance that derived from both of these lacks in the official Generalist plan led to at times centrifugal individual elaborations of the meaning of the Generalist--and this individualized elaboration led, in its turn, to organizational stress and then further individual and group elaboration. The pushes and pulls of these interactions between individuals' needs and

schemas and the official Generalist rationale and plan produced the most curious paradox of the Generalist experiment--a highly formalized and elaborated practice-rationale that failed to guide day-by-day teaching in any real way which was, at the same time, the focus of considerable affectivity on the part of the faculty, an affectivity which had the effect of masking the real nature of the problems in execution that the faculty experienced continually.

The foregoing analysis, derived from Smith and Keith's study of the difficulties experienced by the innovative Kensington elementary school,[6] captures almost completely our feelings about the state of the Generalist experiment when it terminated in June, 1972. Yet the Generalists reached the same unhappy place as Kensington by a different route. The problems at Kensington were the result, in large part, of the interactions of visions of grandeur of the superintendent and principal of the school and the incapacities of their staff to deliver on these visions. The visions in their turn were derived not so much from individual thinking but rather from the piecing together into one grand scheme of almost all the recommendations of contemporary theorists about the proper nature of teaching and learning into one grand, but ill-conceived package.

The push for the Generalist, and the sources of its problems had different origins. They came from within the School. The objectives of the program came from inside the School and entailed no imposition. A group of volunteer faculty were charged to innovate but no detailed specification about what

---

[6]Louis M. Smith and Pat M. Keith, op. cit.

they were to do was offered them. A vague goal was given by the School to a group of faculty with the implicit charge that they were to develop a set of means which would allow delivery on these goals--or something like them. But no means followed from the statement of intent that the School offered these faculty--and while part of the statement implied far-reaching change in both service delivery and training another part of the statement implied only limited change in conventional methods of teaching. Immediately the faculty were faced with a decision which they had to make before they could begin their work--what was to be its scope. For some members of the Generalist group the task was clearly and narrowly defined, to experiment with cross-methods teaching and explore instructional innovations such as the use of the same faculty in class and field; for others the task was much broader, to explore conceptions of a new kind of social worker.

The battle over the scope of the Generalist experiment was fought through the first years of the project and won, uncertainly, by those who defined the terms of reference broadly. But the victory was a narrow one and left them with the task of exploring the nature of both social work delivery and its needs and the means by which training for any new role they might discern. To complete these tasks they had first to define their conception of service delivery, then define the <u>work</u> that was to be done by workers within this new pattern, and then create a program that train workers for this new role. It was this cluster of tasks that defeated the Generalists. For <u>some</u> members of the Generalist faculty

new patterns of service delivery could be found by reaffirming again the continuing relevance of modes of service delivery that were no longer as predominant as they once might have been in the profession. For other members of the faculty new patterns of delivery were required and concomitantly new kinds of workers. For all members of the faculty, however, the profession's traditional commitment to clients, its traditional willingness to go beyond the bounds of any traditionally defined role prescription when client needs required a non-sanctioned service, was a sine qua non of any work. For all faculty this willingness to live beyond self defined a conception of professional leadership that in its turn was the necessary harbinger of lasting and meaningful change in service delivery.

The failure of the Generalist faculty to effect any sustained or sustaining resolution of this conflict in conceptions of their tasks was the source of the intellectual and practical confusions that were omnipresent in the Generalist developmental process. But the schisms in their conception of their task did not produce fundamental organizational schism because all of the members of the group had a common perception of the fundamental nature of the profession's service. Paradoxically, however, this agreement was disfunctional inasmuch as, given the organizational necessity of maintenance of the program, it was both possible, and desirable, to avoid joining the debate about what the Generalist's task was that had to be faced if a concrete and generative image of that practice was to be stabilized, and then defined as the

basis for an exploration of a possible curriculum.

Still another ultimately disfunctional consequence flowed from this situationally embedded inability to face the intellectual issues that confronted the program. Debate about what the Generalist should be surfaced of course at all times. However, the intimacy of the developmental group tended to reduce such debate to the halting exchange of mnemonic slogans that, in its turn, inhibited the sustained reflective examination of the implications of individual positions about the nature of Generalist practice. All members of the faculty, for example, tended to ground their images of proper Generalist practice, whatever the variant, in views of the work of agencies or units within agencies. They tended not to make the extension from such conceptions that was necessary for the development of a curriculum that would serve individuals who might not work in any such units and explore what a Generalist practice by individual workers might mean. As a consequence of this they did not face systematically the task of specifying the nature of the work of a Generalist qua individual with the result that they were not able to either define adequately (or design a curriculum for) what the skills of an individual Generalist should be. Without such a definition and the criteria for curricular decision-making that such a definition would imply, it was difficult to avoid the trap of seeing the prototypical Generalist worker as needing the skills and knowledge of the whole of social work. When the faculty were asked what content the Generalist should know they indeed tended to define them in terms of social work in general.

The Generalist experiment ended for us at this point--the reconciliations among these goals and possibilities that had to be effected before viable curriculum development could begin had not been achieved when we concluded our examination of the program. There was no Generalist as such and so there were no Generalist students trained by the program, only graduates who could associate to a greater or lesser degree with the liturgies and slogans of the program milieu. Individual students who worked with individual faculty of course learned a great deal and were as a result of their experience in both the program and the School indubitably well prepared workers. But the narrowing of variance in aspirations and skills that is the prelude for later development within the profession have not taken place.

We are left with one preoccupation. Program development in social work, indeed in all professional and undergraduate schools, is all too frequently initiated under the legitimating cloak of indubitable goods of the kind that spawned the Generalist. All too often no clear means of either practice or performance or curriculum follow from those goods. We would want to pursue the course of such developments contrasting their successes with the successes of programs initiated because a known skill or content area was thought to be necessary in a given curriculum. We would offer three hypotheses about the courses of such development given our experience in the Generalist program:

(1) Goal-legitimated and goal-initiated course development will have a rockier road than course development begun with the intention of representing defined skill or content areas in a program.

(2) Goal-initiated curriculum development that has a concrete referrent or prototype as its stimulus and ultimate authority will proceed more smoothly than goal-initiated development that has no such referrent. And

(3) Goal-initiated development that takes place under conditions in which a single teacher is charged with acting out his or her intuitions about what the goals mean will run a smoother course than development that takes place collegially.

Our convictions about the odds in each of these cases are, of course, clear. And if our thinking about odds is in any way correct the Generalist had the probabilities of quickly realizable success stacked against it from the beginning. But the work that was done by the Generalist faculty, however halting our interim judgment of it might be, is the only basis for later work. The consequence of this undertaking, which we now believe to be the most difficult kind of curriculum task, is a number of paradigms for fundamentaly new and very exciting social work practices on the one hand and programs on the other. The experience of our colleagues in the Generalist experiment offers the basis for delivering on those promises in the near future.

APPENDIX

THE GENERALIST PROGRAM 1970-72

(Prepared June 1970)

WORKING DEFINITION OF GENERALIST PRACTICE

Generalist practice is evolving in response to an increased awareness of the importance of the community in dealing with social problems. It involves assisting individuals, families, small groups and larger social systems to change in order to promote the best possible relationship between people and their environment. In this process, all social work methods, traditional and innovative, are utilized, singly or in combination, to meet reality needs and to alleviate stresses in ways that enhance or strengthen the inherent capacities of client systems. Generalist practice is addressed to the solution and/or prevention of problems at all levels of society--intra-personal, familial, interpersonal, socioenvironmental, and institutional. Commonly, more than one problem unit is addressed simultaneously.

The generalist usually initiates the process by offering individual or group services to persons who have been identified as having problems in social functioning. In the exploration of these problems, those social, cultural and institutional antecedents in the larger social system that are adversely influencing the clients' social functioning are identified and plans are formulated collaboratively with clients to work toward their solution. In providing effective service, problems in the larger social system stemming from repressive and unjust policies as well as racial injustice are addressed.

In some instances, the generalist practitioner may initiate change in institutional systems before becoming involved with clients. In such instances, the generalist defines the problem and organizes individuals and/or groups to work collaboratively with him to bring about changes in the institutional systems. Thus, the nature of the problems to be solved prescribes the methods to be utilized and the level of intervention of generalist practice.

General Objectives of the Sequence

1. To enable students to acquire knowledge of those social, psychological and environmental forces, and of their complex interrelations, that promote or impede effective social functioning.
2. To enable students to develop a systematic and professionally disciplined method of identifying and analyzing problems of pervasive social disorganization as they are manifest at all levels of society.
3. To enable students to acquire knowledge of, and skill in using, those principles and processes that facilitate change for social betterment in the various personal and social systems.
4. To enable students to develop a professional commitment to work for the alleviation and prevention of problems derived from poverty and racism wherever they may practice.

STATEMENT OF CONTENT FOR GENERALIST--THEORY-PRACTICE COURSE

The Theory-Practice Course should be the integrating course for the total curriculum. In achieving this task the course will of necessity draw from

content presented to the students in the generic courses of SSA as well as from student selected electives. The theory course must be closely coordinated with the field learning so that professional modes of intervention can be examined both cognitively and experientially. The theory course should provide students with the general content and rationale for application in practice. This outline attempts to divide the content that is germane to theory-practice from that content which should be generally acquired elsewhere and integrated for practice.

Organizing Principles for the Generalist Theory-Practice Course

The generalist approach to social work intervention flows from a problem orientation rather than from a methods speciality orientation. The practitioner is able to utilize any one or all social work methods at one or various levels of intervention in seeking alternative solutions to the problem presented by the client(s). The practice theory for the social work methods of casework, group work and community organization are utilized in defining and undergirding the generalist approach to practice.

Change is viewed as an integral part of life. Broad social, technological and political forces produce expected as well as unexpected changes that influence the individual positively and negatively. The effects of such change and also of planned change, based on concern for the worth of individuals, govern the activities of the generalist approach to social work practice. It is assumed that change of some sort takes place in problem-solving.

The locus of client-worker problem-solving may take place at different levels of intervention. The levels of intervention concept designates the client system(s) in which the intervention efforts transpire, namely, individual, family, small group, community, organizational, institution and/or societal.

When oppression, lack of opportunity and/or scarcity of the necessities of life (emotional and physical) prevail, pervasive disorganization frequently results. The generalist approach to social work practice is currently addressing the problems that cause and result from these forces. A necessary aspect of such problem-solving efforts may require the achievement of a state of integration in which survival needs are met and random non-goal directed activities are channeled into productive problem-solving. Once such a stage has been achieved, depending on the motivation and capacity of the client(s) and the opportunities that can be developed, there may or may not be a contract to work for further change at any level of intervention.

Content Specific to Theory-Practice Course

1. The principles of problem-solving and generalist practice.
2. Concepts and processes of change and maintenance in the delivery systems of services whether working with individuals, groups or communities.
3. Practice principles of the generalist approach which draws from all three specialized methods, i.e., community work, casework, group work.
4. The values and goals of social work.
5. The fields of practice and social problems to which the field placement agencies relate, including specific agency policy and procedures.

6.* Dynamics of urban living including the criteria for understanding communities in general as well as the specific community in which field placement agencies are located.

7. Communication theories as central to social work problem-solving: Verbal, behavioral, written.

8.* Social work models for defining and analyzing social problems--for example, Nathan Cohen, MCO, Prevention and Crisis Theory.

9. Relationship theory.

10.* Cooperation and collaboration as essential aspects of generalist practice. Emphasis to be given to the use of sanctions, power and conflict as being integral to cooperation and collaboration.

Supervision, teams and delivery systems of service as specific instances of cooperation and collaboration.

11.* The generalist approach to social work intervention and problem-solving.

*Identified by faculty as content of particular relevance to the generalist approach.

Content from Generic Courses

1. Research methodologies
2. Human growth and socialization
3. Administration and organizational change and maintenance
4. Social work policy and social problems
5. Small group process
6. Racism
7. Poverty

8. Law and individual rights

9. Psychopathology of children and adults

SKILL BASE

Listed below are skills expected of social workers. Each skill is listed along with notations of which qauarters in the academic year the particular skill should be in evidence and further refined and developed.

The student should be able to:

* Explore and identify the problem/concern of the person, group, institution or community and determine the appropriate intervention.
(Quarters 1,2,3,4,5,6)

* Plan and implement a range of prevention and treatment interventions.
(Quarters 3,4,5,6)

Use one's self, existing agency and other community resources to create new resources. Also to appraise the effectiveness of one's own performance.
(Quarters 3,4,5,6)

Assess the social functioning of individuals, groups, communities and in situations.
(Quarters 1,2,3,4,5,6)

Assess the structure and function of the community in meeting individual and group needs, including appraising the effectiveness of services.
(Quarters 3,4,5,6)

Use one's self in order to establish and purposefully use the relationship with clients.
(Quarters 1,2,3,4,5,6)

Understand (comprehension) and communicate in relation to affective and cognitive content.

(Quarters 1,2,3,4,5,6)

Record and utilize data for learning and accountability.

(Quarters 1,2,3,4,5,6)

* Apply a range of models to broad social problems and issues.

(Quarters 4,5,6)

Utilize supervision and consultation.

(Quarters 1,2,3,4,5,6)

*Identified by faculty as unique aspects of the generalist approach.

GENERALIST THEORY-PRACTICE CLASS

MINIMUM LEARNING EXPERIENCES (EXPERIENTIAL)

I. Case assignments engaging individuals on a one-to-one or family level with proboems that concern them personally; and work with individuals as group members, committee members, chairmanshi, para-professionals, etc., that do not necessarily involve them personally (intra-psychically).

II. Assignments involving work with clients who have common concerns that are enough to permit peer learning, generalization of feelings, problem identification, socially satisfying relationships, etc. The use of such small groups as the primary means for problem-solving would be indicated. Membership selection, recruitment into the group and leading or assisting others in leading the group sessions would be required.

III. Assignments that require the students to evaluate service delivery and/or agency goals (include clients in this process when possible) and, where indicated, define problems for solution. A plan for change should be developed and implemented to the fullest extent possible. The process involved in this type of assignment includes collaborative work with staff and/or administrators within the field placement agency and/or with other agencies. It also may include work with staff and/or administrators and members of organizations and community groups to coordinate or improve existing services or to define the need for new services or changes in existing services.

IV. Assignments involving identification of problems and work with clients on problems that an individual family or small group cannot resolve for itself without engaging other social systems and/or institutions within or outside the immediate community in order to bring about change, development or adjustment.

Comment

Field assignments are carried individually and jointly by students in combination that facilitate implementation and enhance the learnings. Assignments can be made across field units. This results in maximum student exposure to one another and to faculty. Another outgrowth is the use of small groups for supervision led jointly by the respective field faculty. Students have experienced greater inter-agency cooperation, (team teaching at its best) in these arrangements. Faculty experienced support and new ideas through shared teaching,

planning, implementation and evaluation. The research component of the generalist curriculum will be partially conducted in the field in collaboration with theory-practice faculty on issues related to students' practicum.